



MEMO

TO Ingo Swann

DATE 14 February 1984

FROM Hal Puthoff

LOCATION G-219

SUBJECT: Documentation, The Whole Story

CC:

You asked me in our last telcon why the documentation issue keeps coming up, and where is the pressure coming from. Therefore, I thought I would write down the whole story.

SG1J

At the beginning of FY '81, [REDACTED] proposed to his organization and others that a concentrated three-year period be given SRI to determine whether RV was a special gift of a few (in which case, though scientifically interesting, could not be expected in the long run to meet DoD needs), or whether it was a robust phenomenon which could be transferred to trainees and thereby become a useful tool, specifically with the thought in mind that, if successful, his organization would begin to train people.

SRI accepted the challenge in the belief that RV was a robust phenomenon that could be so trained. It was left up to SRI as to how to proceed. We could contract with you to develop a program, develop one ourselves based on what we had learned over the years, subcontract to Monroe, etc., etc. As Project Director I opted to subcontract that effort to you and work with you, as I thought that would give us our best shot, a decision I still consider valid.

At the end of the three-year period we attested that we had to first order achieved our goal, although admitting (as did you, in the Science Panel briefing) that we still had full documentation of this achievement left to do. Our sponsor (via [REDACTED] SG1J) represented that the goal had apparently been achieved, but realized that documentation would have to be pursued vigorously in FY '84 to provide the necessary backup so that the client would not be embarrassed about its investment, especially as they expanded into the R&D community for support, and this was the message to SRI. The client had provided funds to SRI to come up with a training program (which would, of course, include some kind of documentation), and at this point SRI was in arrears. At this point it should be noted that it was SRI, not Swann, that had a problem. What arrangements, agreements, etc., we make with our consultants is SRI-internal business; this is where you are shielded. It is SRI who is responsible for meeting requirements; whether we meet them with your help, do it ourselves, or with the help of other consultants is our business. All the client requires is that it be in a defensible position to move forward with a training program, training its own personnel in FY '85, or decide that it cannot be done.

SRI 2903 2/79

SG1J

As the new fiscal year got underway, it appeared to [REDACTED] that SRI was not going to be able to meet its obligation with regard to documentation, whatever the reason, so he decided to step in. As a result of my "circles" memo, he recognized that this was not an appropriate tack to take, so he stepped back.

All of the above you know. Now we get to the part that will be new for you, the price I paid for defending that position. I was called in and told that SRI as an organization, and I as a Project Director, had not met our obligation to provide a viable defensible product for what had been invested with regard to whether training was feasible. Therefore, the project was stopped (I don't mean CRV R&D; I mean everything, intell, search, etc.), and I was told that I had failed as a Project Director, and essentially, went the way of Russell...i.e., no charge number. (Again, I point out that none of this involved you in any way. Our arrangements with you were our own business; this was strictly a client-SRI problem.) In the following period of negotiation to determine whether the relationship should be severed permanently, or whether SRI could meet its obligation to the client, I argued that I thought training was still a viable concept, although I could not at this point provide documentation to prove it; that I thought it would be folly to write off training because of not yet having provided documentation, since we would in effect be throwing out the baby with the bathwater; and that, if given a chance, the training concept as a concept could be documented. On that basis, the SRI contract was re-instated with me on probation as Project Director. I am obliged to document in any way I can the concept that training is a viable concept. I can do it on the basis of working with you to document progress with the other client's trainees; I can set up my own training program using any technique I like, even if it is simply IEEE-style RV; I can subcontract to anyone else, etc. The bottom line is that, as a result of my experience over the past decade, I feel that training as a concept is viable, primarily because of what I have observed working with you. My job at this point is to provide documentation that that feeling has a scientific basis, and I can do that any way I like. There is no pressure on you (as this is not your obligation; you have done your job), nor is there any pressure on me to utilize you or your method to provide this documentation... how I meet this requirement is up to me.

Obviously, since I think your approach is excellent, I would prefer to document the training concept on the basis of your approach. Therefore, although not obligated to meet this requirement on the basis of your approach, I nonetheless wanted to pursue with you as hard as I could whether there was a way to obtain documentation on your method with your cooperation and agreement. For reasons you stated, and which I eventually supported, it was not appropriate to do so with the core R&D group. Given that there was not time for you to work with me on this with a new group because of the commitments to a second client (which were necessary, given the chronology of funding, etc.), I was naturally led to see if there was a way you and I could work together to obtain some documentation (although it was not required) with the new trainees. The pressure therefore came from me, not anyone else, because if a way could have been worked out that would not infringe on that training, I thought it would be best that that the training concept be verified on the basis of your system, not some other. You have indicated to me why that is not appropriate, given the commitment to high-quality ops requirements, and I have accepted that, and duplicated precisely why, as evidenced by my "crystal-growing" memo. If it should turn out that

we can take advantage of an opportunity for a few Class B's along the way, e.g., at the end of Si, Ph 1, ...etc., without being invasive, then that obviously helps the cause. If you decide that that cannot be done, then so be it. So that you know that you have the breathing room you need, I want you to know that I have arranged it that no one holds you responsible for meeting the documentation requirement, as I have taken the position that you are protected by your position as a consultant and by the agreement you and I make on the basis of technical issues, that the documentation issue rests entirely on my shoulders, that it is SRI and I as Project Director who are responsible. I have thus deflected the issue so that it is my credibility, not yours, that is called into question. That is the best I can do.

There you have exactly where I am, scarred though I may be. I must move forward with some effort to document training as a concept, and I can do it any way I choose, but I must do it. I will accept your suggestion that I should consider training some individuals myself in order to document the concept of training as a concept, and I shall also follow up on your suggestion that we arrange for meetings with Dean Jahn, Dixon or whomever is appropriate for the eventual documentation studies required with regard to your concept of training, so that we don't lose what has been developed on that track. That is the only strategy I have at this point to provide you the safe space to deliver the product that you are committed to deliver, and to provide SRI the safe space to provide that safe space, and to insure that all the previous effort does not get not-ised.